

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1. Claims 1, 8-14, 16-17, 19, 21-27, and 30 are pending.

Supplemental Examiner's Amendment

2. A supplemental examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
3. Authorization for an examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Ms. Leila R. Abdi (reg. 52, 399) on January 8, 2009.
4. **In the claims:**

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 30 have been amended. Please replace all prior claims with the claims below.

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising the steps of:

receiving, at a server comprising a central processor, rating information associated with contents of a document from one or more evaluators;

identifying, at the server, a trust score for each of the one or more evaluators, each trust score [[of the trust scores]]for each of the one or more evaluators being a measure of an extent to which a respective evaluator's rating information is considered in determining an aggregate rating, [[said]]each trust score [[of the trust scores]] for each of the one or more evaluators based on factors associated with the respective evaluator,

wherein [[said]]each trust score [[of the trust scores]] for each of the one or more evaluators is based on a rating deviation of the respective evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the respective evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators;

identifying, at the server, a sensitivity score, the sensitivity score indicating a level of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating, wherein a first level sensitivity indicates a higher degree of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating;

determining, at the server, the aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information associated with contents of the document from the one or more evaluators, [[the]] each trust score[[s]] for each of the one or more evaluators, and the sensitivity score;

receiving a request from a recipient [[for the document using a computer]];

identifying, at the server, a suitability profile associated with the recipient, where the suitability profile determines whether any information relating to preferences of the recipient are

stored in a suitability database, and is used to select the document appropriate for the recipient;
and

determining whether to deliver the document in response to the request for the document
based on the suitability profile of the recipient, and the aggregate rating of the document,

wherein determining whether to deliver the document further comprises
determining whether to deliver the document based on whether the aggregate rating
satisfies the suitability profile of the recipient; and

delivering the document to the recipient if the aggregate rating satisfies the
suitability profile of the recipient.

2 - 7. (Cancelled)

8. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein each [[of the]] trust score[[s]] for each of the one or more evaluators is based on a geographical location of the respective evaluator.

9. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein each [[of the]] trust score[[s]] for each of the one or more evaluators is based on one or more prior content ratings received from the respective evaluator.

10. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein each [[of the]] trust score[[s]] for each of the one or more evaluators is based on an industry associated with the respective evaluator.

11. (cancelled)

12. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein each ~~[[of the]]~~ trust score~~[[s]]~~ for each of the one or more evaluators is based on a rating deviation of the respective evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings for the one or more documents.

13. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein ~~[[the]]~~each trust score for each of the one or more evaluators is based on rating information previously received from the respective evaluator for one or more documents.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
determining one or more revised trust scores for one or more of the one or more evaluators; and
determining a revised aggregate rating based on the one or more revised trust scores.

15. (Cancelled)

16. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the document is an advertisement.

17. (previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the document comprises at least one of a web page, content that can be used in a web page, or a program.

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the one or more evaluators are selected using a random selection algorithm.

20. (Cancelled)

21. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving new rating information for the document; and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the document.

22. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion.

23. (previously presented) The method of claim 22, wherein the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, or targeted age.

24. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a quantity.

25. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mean of the rating information.

26. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mode of the rating information.

27. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a median of the rating information.

28-29. (Cancelled)

30. (Currently Amended) A system comprising:

a server including a central processor;

means for receiving, at the server, rating information associated with contents of a document from one or more evaluators;

means for identifying, at the server, a trust score for each of the one or more evaluators, each trust score[[of the trust scores]] for each of the one or more evaluators being a measure of an extent to which a respective evaluator's rating information is considered in determining an aggregate rating, [[said]] each trust score [[of the trust scores]] for each of the one or more evaluators based on factors associated with the respective evaluator,

wherein [[said]] each trust score [[of the trust scores]]for each of the one or more evaluators is based on a rating deviation of the respective evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the respective evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators;

means for identifying, at the server, a sensitivity score, the sensitivity score indicating a level of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating, wherein a first level sensitivity indicates a higher degree of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating;

means for determining, at the server, the aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information associated with contents of the document, [[the]] each trust score[[s]] for each of the one or more evaluators, and the sensitivity score;

means for receiving a request from a recipient~~[[, the request being relevant to a criteria for the document]]~~;

means for identifying, at the server, a suitability profile associated with the recipient, where the suitability profile determines whether any information relating to preferences of the recipient are stored in a suitability database, and is used to select the document appropriate for the recipient; and

means for determining whether to deliver the document in response to the request for the document based on the suitability profile of the recipient, and the aggregate rating of the document,

wherein the means for determining whether to deliver the document further comprises determining whether to deliver the document based on whether the aggregate rating satisfies the suitability profile of the recipient; and

delivering the document to the recipient if the aggregate rating satisfies the suitability profile of the recipient.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1, 8-14, 16-17, 19, 21-27, and 30 are allowed.
- 6.. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

The claims are directed to a system for rating documents by evaluators, documents such as advertisements, determining if the documents are rated according to suitability, and determining whether the suitability profile is met before delivering them to a user or provider. In doing so, the invention determines an aggregated rating that satisfies a suitability profile of a recipient. The aggregate rating is based on rating information of an evaluator for the content, a trust score of the evaluator, and sensitivity score. Where each trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator and the rating deviation based on a comparison of rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and rating information for the one or more documents. A sensitivity score indicating a level of conservatism by which to aggregate content ratings. Where if a first level sensitivity score may indicate that the aggregate rating should be aggregated very conservatively, and means for example, if one evaluator rated a document as

inappropriate for children, then the aggregate rating will also indicate that the document is inappropriate for children even if the “average” rating would indicate that the content is appropriate for all ages. The suitability profile determines whether any information relating to the preferences of the recipient are stored in a suitability database and used to select a document appropriate for the recipient. Thus, when a document's aggregate rating satisfies a suitability profile, the document is presented to a user. In doing so, provides benefits such as finding more users who are likely to purchase an advertised item when making requests to different documents.

With respect to the independent claims, the prior art of record, single or in combination, does not teach or fairly suggest the step of: identifying, at the server, a trust score for each of the one or more evaluators, each trust score for each of the one or more evaluators being a measure of an extent to which a respective evaluator's rating information is considered in determining an aggregate rating, each trust score for each of the one or more evaluators based on factors associated with the respective evaluator, wherein each trust score for each of the one or more evaluators is based on a rating deviation of the respective evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the respective evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators; identifying, at the server, a sensitivity score, the sensitivity score indicating a level of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating, wherein a first level sensitivity indicates a higher degree of conservatism in determining the aggregate rating; determining, at the server, the aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information

associated with contents of the document, each trust score for each of the one or more evaluators, and the sensitivity score; receiving a request from a recipient; identifying, at the server, a suitability profile associated with the recipient, where the suitability profile determines whether any information relating to preferences of the recipient are stored in a suitability database, and is used to select the document appropriate for the recipient, in combination with the other claimed limitations. Independent claim 30 recites similar limitations. Dependent claims are allowed for depending on an allowed claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance".

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167